

Appl. No. 10/065,655
Amdt. dated May 06, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 17, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-5 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-5 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft et al (hereinafter Kraft) (US 6,487,424) in view of Chien (US 6,393,445) for reasons of record.

Response:

Independent claim 1 is amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 1 now recites checking a character to determine if the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule. If the character-encoding rule of the checked character is the second character-encoding rule, no characters are transformed to another encoding rule.

Chien teaches a method to transform specific two character-encoding rules. When likening the step 401 in Chien's patent to the step (b) in the present application, as mentioned in the Office action of March 17, 2005, "the second character-encoding rule" should be defined. In the present application, "the second character-encoding rule" is one character-encoding rule which is predetermined to be correctly displayed or outputted according to the following steps (c) and (d). In Chien's patent, however, the input document should be encoded in either a simplified Chinese character or a traditional Chinese character, and the simplified Chinese character and the traditional Chinese character will be detected in step 401 and further transformed into the other in steps 402 and 403. Since the simplified Chinese character or the traditional Chinese character will be transformed in to the other format in Chien's disclosure, the step 401 in Chien's patent is not pertinent to the step (b) of claim 1 in the present application complying with the limitation that the second character-encoding rule is one character-encoding rule which is predetermined to be correctly displayed or outputted. A mere checking step for character-encoding rules is not persuasive for likening the present application to the combination of Chien's and Kraft's disclosure, and

Appl. No. 10/065,655
Amdt. dated May 06, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 17, 2005

the further conditions and requirements of claim 1 are not taught by the combination. Apparently, as described above, the different requirements and conditions in Chien's disclosure restrict the occurrence of the transforming step after the character-encoding rule is detected, and thus, Chien's disclosure fails to anticipate the steps (b), (c), and (d) of claim 1.

5 Chien only teaches detecting the character type of the input data to see if it is either a simplified Chinese character or a traditional Chinese character. Once the character type is detected, the character is then immediately switched to be the other character type. Thus, Chien does not teach or suggest not transforming the checked character if it is already encoded with the second character-encoding rule.

10 As described above, Chien does not teach determining if a checked character is encoded with the second character-encoding rule followed by a transforming step when at least one character is encoded with the first character-encoding rule. Even if original simplified or traditional Chinese characters can be deemed as "the second character-encoding rule" in Chien's process, Chien does not teach a further step wherein the input data then encoded in
15 "the second character-encoding rule". Therefore the amended claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Kraft and Chien. Claims 2-5 and 9-15 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-5 and 9-15 is respectfully requested.

20 2. Rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraft in view of Chien, and further in view of Atkin et al (hereinafter Atkin) for reasons of record.

25 **Response:**

Atkin only teaches that the Unicode character set can contain double byte (DB) characters. Atkin does not teach conversion between Unicode characters set and the Big-5 or GB encoding sets. Therefore, the limitations of claim 8 are not taught by Kraft, Chien,

Appl. No. 10/065,655
Amdt. dated May 06, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 17, 2005

or Atkin, and is patentably distinguished from the cited prior art. Furthermore, claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

- 5 In light of the above reasons in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

10 Winston Hsu

Date: May 6, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

- 15 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan).